



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,659	11/17/2003	Joel V. Weinstock	27045/2032	5366
29933	7590	06/27/2008		
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP				
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE				
BOSTON, MA 02199				
EXAMINER				
ZEMAN, ROBERT A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1645				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,659

Applicant(s)

WEINSTOCK ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT A. ZEMAN

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 3-18-2008 is acknowledged. Claim 8 has been amended. Claims 17-23 have been added. Claims 10-16 have been canceled. Claims 1-9 and 17-23 are pending. Claims 1-7 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 8 and 17-23 are currently under examination.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Summers et al. (American Journal of Gastroenterology, 2003, Vol. 98 No. 9, pages 2035-2041) is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto. It should be noted that this rejection may be reinstated once the new matter issue set forth below is resolved.

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Weinstock et al. (Currents, Fall 2000-Winter 2001, Vol.2, No. 1, Published online by the University of Iowa Health Care. <http://www.uihealthcare.com/news/currents/vol2issue1/1helminths.html> accessed 6-6-2006) is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto. It should be noted that this rejection may be reinstated once the new matter issue set forth below is resolved.

Claim Rejections Maintained

35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8, 17-18, 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weinstock et al. (WO 99/33479) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action in the rejection of claim 8.

Applicant argues:

1. Weinstock et al. do not teach a method of treating an animal with the claimed composition and then the level of regulatory T cell activity.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

Weinstock et al. disclose the determination of Th1 and Th2 responses after treatment with the claimed composition "in order to show efficacy" of their method (see page 21). Said responses were determined by measuring the production of various cytokines and cell surface markers (see pages 21-25).

As outlined previously, Weinstock et al. disclose methods of treating methods of treating diseases associated with an aberrant/enhanced Th1 response by administering a helminthic parasite preparation. Said diseases include Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, type 1 diabetes mellitus, lupus erythematosus, Sarcoidosis and multiple sclerosis (see abstract). Consequently, Weinstock et al. anticipate all the limitations of the rejected claim.

New Grounds of Rejection

35 USC § 112, New Matter

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8 and 17-23 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 18 to recite “and determining the level of regulatory T cell activity, wherein an increase in regulatory T cell activity after said administering is indicative of successful treatment.” This phrase does not appear in the specification, or original claims as filed. The portion of the specification Applicant cites as providing support deals only with autoimmune diseases and allergic diseases whereas the instant claims encompass any Th1 or Th2 related disease. Consequently, the cited portion of the specification does not provide support for the full breadth of the instant claims. Therefore this limitation is new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinstock et al. (WO 99/33479).

Weinstock et al. disclose methods of treating methods of treating diseases associated with an aberrant/enhanced Th1 response by administering a helminthic parasite preparation. Said diseases include Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, type 1 diabetes mellitus, lupus erythematosus, Sarcoidosis and multiple sclerosis (see abstract). Consequently, Weinstock et al. anticipate all the limitations of the rejected claim. Weinstock et al. further disclose the determination of Th1 and Th2 responses after treatment with the claimed composition "in order to show efficacy" of their method (see page 21). Said responses were determined by measuring the production of various cytokines and cell surface markers (see pages 21-25).

Weinstock et al. differs from the instant invention in that they don't explicitly disclose the regulatory T cell markers recited in claims 19 and 21. However, in view of the KSR decision, since the use of screening of the recited T cell activation markers is well known in the art

yielding predictable results, it is obvious for the skilled artisan to use them in the methods of Weinstock et al. for determination of Th1 and Th2 responses after treatment with the claimed composition “in order to show efficacy” of their method (see *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, No. 04-1350 [U.S. Apr. 30, 2007])

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT A. ZEMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m. .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shanon Foley can be reached on (571) 272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.